

1 MITCHELL S. FUERST  
2 Florida Bar No. 264598  
3 mfuerst@fuerstlaw.com  
4 Fuerst Ittleman, PL  
5 1001 Brickell Bay Drive, Suite 2002  
6 Miami, Florida 33131  
7 Telephone: (305) 350-5690  
8 Facsimile: (305) 371-8989  
9 Appearing *pro hac vice*

7 LESLIE HOLMES  
8 California Bar No. 192608  
9 Leslie@HULawyers.com  
10 HOLMES & USOZ, LLP  
11 333 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 805  
12 San Jose, California 95113  
13 Telephone: (408) 292-7600  
14 Facsimile: (408) 292-7611

12 Attorney for Defendants:  
13 WELLNESS SUPPORT NETWORK, INC.,  
14 ROBERT HELD, and  
15 ROBYN HELD

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 WELLNESS SUPPORT NETWORK, INC., a  
23 corporation, ROBERT HELD, individually and  
24 as an officer of Wellness Support Network,  
25 Inc., and ROBYN HELD, individually and as  
26 an officer of Wellness Support Network, Inc.,

27 Defendants.  
28

Case No.: 3:10-cv-04879-JCS

**JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE  
SCHEDULE; DECLARATION OF  
MITCHELL S. FUERST IN SUPPORT**

Hearing Date: TBD  
Courtroom A, 15th Floor

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Joseph C. Spero

## I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 18, 2011, pursuant to a stipulation by the parties to revise the stipulated and ordered schedule for this matter (Dkt #22), the Court entered an order (Dkt # 26) setting deadlines for, among other things, the filing deadlines for Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and Defendants' responsive papers, the parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, file a Rule 26(f) report, complete initial disclosures, and file a Case Management Schedule. The parties requested revision of the schedule because of the Court's Order granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint filed on December 29, 2010 (Dkt #24).

On April 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed its Amended Complaint for Permanent Injunction or other Equitable Relief (Dkt #27). As per the Court's April 18 Order, Defendants' responsive pleadings to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint are due May 19, 2011. However, given the complexities associated with this case, as well as undersigned counsel's scheduling conflicts during the month of May, the parties agreed to a 20-day extension of that deadline. Given that extension, the parties also agreed that the tasks to be performed as required by the *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* would be performed more accurately and efficiently based upon the time modifications stipulated to below.

At this time, pursuant to L.R. 6-2 and L.R. 7-12, the parties respectfully request that the deadlines set in the Court's April 18, 2011 Order be extended by an additional 20 days. The proposed schedule is set forth below.

## II. PROPOSED REVISED SCHEDULE

The parties propose the following modifications to the current schedule for this case:

1. Defendants' Answer and/or other responsive pleadings shall be filed no later than June 8, 2011.

2. The last day to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection, and discovery plan shall be July 5, 2011.

3. The last day to file for ADR Certification shall be July 5, 2011.

4. The last day to file either a Stipulation to ADR Process or Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference shall be July 5, 2011.

5. The last day to file Rule 26(f) Reports, complete initial disclosures or state objections in a Rule 26(f) Report, and file a Case Management Statement shall be July 18, 2011.

6. The Initial Case Management Conference shall be held on July <sup>29</sup>~~28~~, 2011.

### III. CONCLUSION

The parties respectfully request that the Court revise the schedule as set forth above.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 12, 2011

FUERST ITTLEMAN, PL

HOLMES & USOZ, LLP

By: /s/ Mitchell S. Fuerst

Mitchell S. Fuerst

Attorney for Defendants, WELLNESS  
SUPPORT NETWORK, ROBERT HELD, and  
ROBYN HELD

By: /s/ Leslie Holmes

Leslie Holmes

Attorney for Defendants, WELLNESS  
SUPPORT NETWORK, ROBERT HELD, and  
ROBYN HELD

Dated: May 12, 2011

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

By: /s/ Laura Fremont


Laura Fremont

Kenneth H. Abbe

Attorney for Plaintiff, FEDERAL TRADE  
COMMISSION

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED: 5/16/11



**DECLARATION OF MITCHELL S. FUERST  
IN SUPPORT OF JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE SCHEDULE**

I, MITCHELL S. FUERST, declare as follows:

1. I am counsel for Wellness Support Network, Inc. ("Wellness"), Robert Held and Robyn Held, (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants"), Defendants in the above-captioned action. I make this Declaration in support of the foregoing Joint Stipulation to Revise Schedule. I have personal knowledge of each of the following facts, and would and could competently testify thereto if called upon to do so in a court of law.

2. **Reasons for the requested enlargement of time (Local Rule 6-2(a)(1)):** The current deadline for the Defendants to file their responsive papers to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is May 19, 2011. However, given the complexities associated with this case, as well as undersigned counsel's scheduling conflicts during the month of May, undersigned counsel requested and the government agreed to a 20-day extension of that deadline. Given that extension, the parties also agreed that the tasks to be performed as required by the *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* would be performed more accurately and efficiently based upon the time modifications included in the attached stipulation.

3. **Disclosure of all previous time modifications (Local Rule 6-2(a)(2)):** The Plaintiff filed its Complaint (Dkt #1) in this matter on October 28, 2010. Defendants' initial deadline to respond to the Complaint was November 26, 2010. On November 24, 2010, the parties filed a stipulation (Dkt #5) to extend that deadline to December 29, 2010; to set the deadline for Plaintiff to file its opposition to any papers filed by Defendants responsive to the Complaint to January 14, 2011; and to set the hearing for such matters for February 4, 2011. The Court so ordered on November 29, 2010 (Dkt #6).

On December 15, 2010, the parties filed a stipulation (Dkt #7) to modify the times set in the Court's *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* (Dkt #3). The Court so ordered on December 15, 2010 (Dkt #8).

On January 26, 2011, the parties filed a Second Stipulation to Revise Schedule (Dkt #21) to modify the times set in the Court's *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* (Dkt #3). The Court so ordered on January 27, 2011 (Dkt #22).

On April 4, 2011, the Court entered an Order (Dkt #24) granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint. As a result of this Order, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation (Dkt # 25) on April 18, 2011 to provide timeframes for Plaintiff to re-plead its Complaint in part and for Defendants to file responsive papers. The Court so ordered on April 18, 2011 (Dkt #26).

4. **Description of the effect the requested time modification would have on the schedule for the case (Local Rule 6-2(a)(3)):** The proposed time modifications would extend the time for those matters set in the order issued by the Court ( Dkt # 26), but the parties believe doing so would add to the long-term efficient conduct of this case. The tasks to be performed as required by the *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* would be performed more accurately and efficiently based upon the time modifications included in the attached stipulation.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this Declaration was executed on May 12, 2011 at Miami, Florida.

/s/ Mitchell S. Fuerst  
 Mitchell S. Fuerst  
 Attorney for Defendant